RESTORATION REVIEW

Socrates was a hound of heaven among the Greeks. They could not have easy consciences so long as he walked their streets. "I must obey God rather than you," he told them, and died for that faith.

See SOCRATES: GOD'S GADFLY, p. 49

Volume 10, No. 3 **March, 1968**

Volume 10, No. 3 **Leroy Garrett, Editor** **March 1968**

A. C. C. Threatens Expulsion …

IS ABILENE AN ANTIOCH OR A JERUSALEM?

Every important movement has its polarities of thought, with persuasions moving from the far right to the far left. The Restoration Movement is no exception, for from the time of its inception our leaders have been poles apart in their thinking. Our heritage includes "rightists" or *conservatives* like Fanning and Franklin and "leftists" or *liberals* like Ainsworth and Pinkerton. Even with the four Disciple patriarchs (Thomas and Alexander Campbell, Barton Stone, and Walter Scott) there was polarity of thought, with Scott rather far to the right and Stone definitely to the left. The Campbells were more toward center, where most of us would probably place ourselves.

So it was with the primitive community of saints. As Jewish believers Stephen and Paul were liberals in their attitude toward Gentiles and the demands of Judaism, as was Jesus before them. James and Peter were toward the other pole. One fails to understand much in the New Testament scriptures if he does not realize this diversity of thought and the strain it placed upon the communion of the saints. It was a remarkable display of love that the primitive community was able to survive and plant a catholic Christianity on European soil. It is also to the credit of our own founding fathers that the Restoration Movement was indeed a *movement* despite its polarites.

This dichotomy is sometimes identified as *Jerusalem* and *Antioch*, for Jerusalem represents the orthodoxy of James, while Antioch stands for the more inclusive view of Paul. Jerusalem is to the right, Antioch to the left. None of us these days particularly goes for these labels, but in this context they do have meaning, for there is reflected here two entirely different views as to the nature of the gospel and the mission of God's community.

If we look at our own Churches of Christ, we will see the same diversity of thought, moving toward opposite poles. This explains why we find ourselves closer to some in other churches than we are to many in our own segment of Christendom. A "liberal" Church of Christ man may, therefore, be closer in spirit to a "conservative" Episcopalian

than one of his own "anti" brothers. But an interesting way to view our own polarity is by a study of the colleges. It would be here, if anywhere, that any thinking would be going on.

Among our older colleges David Lipscomb College and Freed-Hardeman College are definitely to the right, while Abilene Christian College and, to a lesser degree in recent years, George Pepperdine College are to the left. If we state it in terms of cities, we can say that Nashville is our Jerusalem and Abilene is our Antioch.

In Nashville the seeds of orthodoxy are so thoroughly sown and re-sown that we look for no new ideas or fresh insights to emerge there. Abilene is in the west and is younger, and it knows the world of oil and cattle and has discovered places like Harvard. If anything significant ever happened among us in terms of ideas, we would expect it to be at Abilene. If ever our people join the Christian world, we would suppose it to be Abilene that would lead the way.

This is, of course, a generalization, for the polarity we speak of is present on each campus. Abilene surely has its rightists. One member of the Bible faculty has recently threatened to expose all the others as *liberals*, and he has been in touch with at least one editor with his list of names, which, we understand, has everyone's name on it except his own! And Lipscomb has its leftists or *did* have! Recently in the same mail were letters from two professors in the same department of an orthodox Church of Christ college. The men were poles apart in their ideas, one an obscurant preserver of "the old paths," while the other reflected the vision of Stephen, who was murdered for being a liberal. Needless to say that the latter was unhappy in his situation and was in search for a way Out. The former was blissfully happy, or so it would seem, enjoying the Nirvana of his own arrogance.

We might observe here in passing, as I learned from one of my old Harvard profs, that it is the conservative that creates the liberal. The liberal mind is a reaction to the duress of the illiberal mind. If orthodoxy paid less attention to unorthodox views they might peter Out. It is when one seeks to constrain another's thinking that he pushes one into what he then calls "liberalism."

In saying that Abilene is the Antioch of the Church of Christ we hope we are not indulging in wishful thinking. While there are strong indications that this is so, there continues to be disturbing developments to the contrary. Most of its educational program, including the annual lectureship, continues to be geared to the party line. Its prospective faculty are interrogated in a fashion that would be more fitting for membership in the Communist Party than for service in an institution of *liberal* education. Not only must one be a Church of Christ member, and in the right party at that, but even his political views are sifted. And recently the Bible faculty has been requested to sign a kind of "loyalty oath" in which each professor subscribes to a safe and orthodox view of inspiration. (We can hardly say a scriptural view, for there is no doctrine of inspiration in the Bible.)

We admit that this sounds more like Jerusalem than Antioch, but such illiberal tactics may be an effort to hold the line against a wave of liberal thought that is inundating the Hill. That the administration, which may be adamantly orthodox for pragmatic reasons as much as from personal conviction, is on the verge of panic in the face of new ideas is indicated by its treatment of a group of students who have dared to act and think for themselves. They actually threatened the students with expulsion from college if they did not change their ways. And we are not talking about hippies or rioters or demonstrators. It is not a question of guitars or long hair or sit-ins. The students involved are as fine a young people as you would find in anybody's college. The college threatened to expel them because of their religious views and practices! Their crime was in being different.

A dozen or so of these students were meeting off campus in a non-Church of Christ home for prayer and Bible study. They were especially engrossed in matters relative to the Holy Spirit. While we do not have details on the nature of their meetings, which were held periodically, we assume that this involved a mutual sharing of experiences of their communion with the Spirit. Perhaps they prayed together for the gift of the Spirit. There may even have been tongue-speaking.

But we do know that they were summoned by an administrative official and summarily instructed to desist with such meetings forthwith or be expelled from college.

This occurred at a time when it was too late to enroll at another college, and so a full term of credits would be lost. Some of the young men had been deferred by their draft boards. Expulsion would have jeopardized their chances to get their education before being shipped off to war. But the administration did not appear to be sensitive to these personal problems.

Some of the parents, however, were concerned. The father of one of the students flew to Abilene to see what could be done, taking with him an attorney, who happened to be an Episcopalian. The ensuing conversations revealed that the college had been aware of "the Holy Spirit meetings" for a long while, and that the administration could have given their ultimatum at a more convenient time for the students, such as between semesters, so that they could have continued their education elsewhere. Since the college's giant Lectureship was upcoming, some involved had the suspicion that the administration was trying to clean out all the heterodoxy before the constituency arrived.

The attorney pointed out to the administration that ACC had been the recipient of federal grants, and that such grants were given on the condition that no prejudice be shown students in respect to race, creed or color. It was further observed that the students were in no way interfering with the program of the college, but were merely exercising their freedom of religious expression, that the meetings were not even held on campus but in a private home. The lawyer also explained that the ultimatum was an imposition upon the personal rights of the students and an invasion of their private lives.

For these reasons the case would be taken to court, the attorney avowed, if the college carried out their threat of expulsion.

The administrator who had spoken for the college up to this point, a second level officer, explained that the ultimatum was not his own, but that he was acting upon orders from his superiors, and that he would consult with them about what to do. The last we heard is that the college officials still have the matter under advisement, the students are still in school and presumably are still communing with the Holy Spirit.

We readily admit that this sounds more like something that would happen at Freed-Hardeman or David Lipscomb than at Abilene, if indeed it had to happen anywhere in our ranks. Our readers may even find it hard to believe. At about this same time it was in the news that Howard Payne College, a Baptist institution not far from Abilene, had announced a policy to the effect that no hippie would be allowed to enroll, and if one became a hippie while a student he would be asked to leave. Most of us can sympathize with this, for after all a college can hardly do its work with such distractions to endure. But it just doesn't make sense for a Christian college to ban students because they believe in the Holy Spirit. This is surely a "first" in the history of American education—for students to be threatened with expulsion for praying together!

I can understand why the lawyer involved was flabbergasted by what he saw and heard on the Hill at Abilene. As an attorney of many years he thought he had seen everything, but here is one he'll be telling to his cronies at conventions for many years to come. There is no possible way for an "outsider" to understand how things like this can happen among us Church of Christ folk. But to those of us who have been around for awhile it is easy enough to understand, tragic as it is. And we understand that the administration at ACC is by no means malevolent. To the contrary they are well-meaning Christian gentlemen. How then is such behavior to be explained?

One word tells much of the story, a term that explains a lot about the schizophrenic behavior within "the system" of Churches of Christ—desperation. Administrators who are otherwise sound in their educational philosophy and professional ethics will fire some of their best faculty, violating all the rules of *academicia*, because of some doctrinal abnormality. That has happened only recently at several of our colleges. It is desperation. There is a mortal fear of anything that threatens the system. Such brethren are to be pitied more than censored. Perhaps the very Holy Spirit who is sought by the ACC students can bring peace into the hearts of these men—and to us all.

The father of one of the threatened students told the ACC dean that he would accompany the dean to one of these meetings, that they would together join the students with open Bibles and in prayer, and find out for themselves what was going on. This calm, peaceful, Spirit-filled approach to a problem finds most of us unprepared, for we simply haven't the maturity to deal with matters this way. If we had the maturity, we wouldn't

have such a problem to start with. For too long now we have vilified, written people up, debated, disfellowshipped, divided, and even expelled. These are immature ways to deal with human sensitivities, too much like the tactics of the Salem witch-hunters.

What a tremendous impact it would have had upon the students at Abilene if the president of the college (and a great and good man he is, too) could have made his way to that non-Church of Christ home where the students were praying in the Holy Spirit and said something like this: “Dear young friends, I am a man who is growing old and will soon be retiring. I have lots of problems, and the college has lots of problems. It may be that you have learned things about prayer that I do not know. I have come ro pray with you.”

The tragedy of all this is that ACC does not really need to be fearful of the unusual Their desperation is not necessary. Most of the faculty would defend the students in their right to seek deeper truths in their own way, even if they disagreed with their conclusions. Indeed, a group of faculty delivered a formal protest to the administration for its action. The rank and file of brethren, even those who are wary of “this Holy Spirit thing”, would go along with the college in preserving an atmosphere in which ideas can compete. This is what *liberal* education means, and this is what most parents want for their children. To be sure, ACC is fortunate to have such diversity of thought in both faculty and students. Nothing is so boring and unexciting as sameness. God never intended it—and it is good for us that He didn’t, for we would never in this world attain it except through intellectual suicide.

So we conclude by saying that, despite a lot of things that might suggest the contrary, Abilene is our Antioch. They may fire faculty and threaten students, stack their lectureship, indoctrinate as much as educate, maintain a parochial faculty (or try to), and follow the party line, but even Paul’s Antioch had similar legalistic problems in breaking away from Judaism and moving out into the larger world. Indeed, all this desperation at Abilene is an effort ro “hold the line” for orthodoxy. We have good news for them. They’ll never make it.

By the way, the record in *Acts* reveals that the Holy Spirit was very much at work in Antioch. He spoke to them while they were fasting (of all things), and it was He who sent forth Paul and Barnabas on their mission to the Gentiles, a kind of expulsion you might say.

Is the same Spirit at work on the Hill in Abilene?

⁂ ⁂ ⁂

REMOVING THE RUBBISH

Thanks to Mayor Lindsey and Governor Rockefeller, and especially the 10,000 members of the striking Sanitationmen's Association in New York, the nation has been made aware of the problem of garbage. Thousands of tons of garbage piled up all over New York during the 9-day strike, causing fire and epidemic hazards. Even out in the streets one was not safe from rats. The city was soon up in arms: the rubbish must go!

That this had its political overtones is apparent enough, involving as it did both the governor and the mayor. Some news media viewed the garbage in terms of national political implications. A headline in *The National Observer* read: "How Trash Dispute Affects Rockefeller Image."

As important as such implications may be, it reminded me of the more general problem of rubbish in such areas as religion and education. In the streets of a great city the presence of garbage is much more evident than that which piles up in our minds, but it is surely no more real and no less hazardous to one's welfare. It would be in order, therefore, for a number of us who are acquainted with conditions in school and church, not to mention the more intimate confines of our own minds, to rise up and cry: the rubbish must go!

In his book *Experiments in Living,* Prof. MacBeath of Belfast, Ireland, had something to say about rubbish in a statement on moral philosophy: "Character is improved and moral goodness realized by doing whatever is right in the circumstances, whether it be the humblest domestic duty or ruling an empire, whether it be removing the rubbish that disfigures a street or the rubbish that lies in the way to knowledge."

Since much of my life is centered in the university classroom, I am keenly aware of the rubbish that has a way of piling up in the educative process, obstructing the way to zestful learning. Part of this is what I call "Preoccupation with peripheral concerns," whether it be clubs, fraternities and sororities, parties, "professional" athletics, or what have you. A student who is always on the run in the periphery is likely to miss the real stuff of education. So with the faculty. If it is kept preoccupied with all sorts of meetings, it has little time to read, think, and teach. Such rubbish must be removed from our campuses. One of the great dangers modern education faces is uninspiring teachers, and teachers who haven't time ro teach can hardly be inspiring. Bel Kaufman's *Up the Down Staircase* is a hilarious testimonial to all the rubbish that is in a teacher's way, especially at the high school level.

Equally serious is the inertia of the typical classroom situation that allows for so little critical thinking. We do not necessarily educate young people by lecturing to them. We must cause them to think. A lot of data can pass from a teacher's lecture notes to the student's writing pad and back to the teacher again in an exam without any important thinking ever taking place. Something is wrong when education is boring. A lot of rubbish needs to be removed.

As important as it is to clear the rubbish cluttering up education, it is even more imperative that God's people become sanitation workers who will clean up the mess that impedes the function of the colony of heaven.

This was the problem in rebuilding the walls of Jerusalem. Neh. 4:10 reads: "There is much rubbish; we are not able to work on the wall." It seems that the work of restoration necessitates the removal of a lot of rubbish. This is especially the case in reference to a restoration of the bond of union between brothers who have been long divided, for there is much that encrustates the simple truth that makes men one.

Let us look at some of the more damaging rubbish heaps that have piled up in the brotherhood through the years, causing new divisions among us or preserving old ones.

1. *Sectarian interpretation of scripture*

What rubbish this has become! Even while we claim to be unsectarian we are the most sectarian in the way we often handle the Bible, even to the point of using the scriptures to justify maltreatment of a brother. We make 2 John 9-10 mean that if a brother differs with us on the millennium or the use of an organ that he has departed from the doctrine of Christ and is therefore beyond the reaches of fellowship. "If anyone does not bring this doctrine. . . " is applied to virtually every opinion among us when the context makes it clear that such interpretations are impossible. These are party interpretations that must, like rubbish, be cleaned away.

2. The "Loyal Church" Fallacy

Our perpetual habit of division stems from this, for each party among us justifies its existence on the ground that it is *loyal,* having separated itself from "brothers in error." All of us are brothers in error, and no one faction can claim to be loyal. The sinful world and the sectarian spirit have effected us all. Security cannot be found by joining the right institution that teaches the right doctrines, but by a personal relationship with the Christ. All who sustain that union with Christ are brothers together, even when the group with which they are identified is less than what it ought to be, which is true of them all.

3. The Church with the Right Name

The community of God as revealed in scripture has no name or names. Any group, therefore, that makes an issue of "the right name", or that wears a name so as to make it its own property, is only piling up trash. If a group distinguishes itself by adopting the name "Church of God," which is of course a scriptural term, it is only being sectarian, for it is defining itself in such a way as to imply that others are not churches of God. So with our denominating ourselves "Church of Christ." If we really wish to be scriptural, we will recognize no name or names at all. We will simply be God's people, and will freely use all the descriptions that are proper for His community. We will thus remove a barrier.

4. *The "Book, Chapter, and Verse" Kind of Thinking*

There is of course nothing wrong in citing book, chapter and verse, but at the same time there is nothing especially efficacious about it. One can line up passages a mile long, and roll off all sorts of references of where to find what (which is mostly ignored anyhow), and yet be doing very little real teaching. We need to interpret the Word, and not simply string out passages like sausages. In most cases the boring ordeal of listening to a "book, chapter and verse" kind of presentation is so much rubbish. Let us take a portion of scripture or an idea and study it in depth, showing the relevance it has to the *now* of our lives.

5. *The Failure to Make Important Distinctions*

We fail to distinguish between the community of God and the Restoration Movement, and what evils this has brought our way! The Restoration Movement is not the church, not does it represent a restoration of the church. It is rather a movement within the church (which has been all along and has never ceased to be since the apostles) to restore to the church certain deficiencies—*brotherhood* being one of them. We also fail to distinguish between *gospel* and *doctrine,* an error that has strewn a lot of garbage, for it has confused our concept of ministry.

6. The Pattern Fallacy

This is perhaps the most threatening pile of rubbish of all, for it continues to give us problems in long division. It is the idea that there is a blueprint kind of pattern for the work, worship and organization of the church, and, yes, even the name. So each one interprets "the pattern" by his own liking, and if others do not conform, they are rejected as unsound for not "taking the Book for what it says." The truth is that the scriptures do not speak, and it was never intended that they should speak, regarding the detailed structure of the Lord's congregation. We are slow to see that the primitive community had "the pattern" long before there was a *New Testament* for them, and that pattern was Christ. The scriptures are indeed a norm for our experiences in Christ, but patternism is divisive garbage that must go.

7. *Stress on the Superficial*

Whether this takes the form of institutions, church edifices, large numbers, "image" consciousness, professionalism in the pulpit, we are doing much that suggests we are missing the point of Christianity—and that is to be conformed to the likeness of Christ. We are preoccupied with all sorts of building programs, and you will notice that our most spiritual people (such as our youth that are going inner-city, Faith Corps, etc.) simply are not interested in our real estate projects. Some have given their lives to the erection of a "Madison Avenue" type edifice in New York. Others, with different concerns, have gone to the slums of Harlem to witness for Christ in the streets, and they could not care less for our impressive buildings.

Prepare your own list of garbage heaps in our thinking and practice. This list is fragmentary and incomplete, but it points to matters that should concern us. “There is much rubbish; we are not able to work on the wall” Away with the rubbish!—*the Editor*

⁂ ⁂ ⁂

The Quest of God . . .

SOCRATES: GOD’S GADFLY

In this series we are defending the thesis that the nature of God is such that He is always in loving pursuit of the human heart. His mercy is so great and so enduring that no man is ever beyond the pale of His loving concern. He is “the Hound of Heaven” who pursues man even when he does not want to be pursued. It is therefore God who is in quest of man more than man who is in quest of God. In many different ways He does not let us forget that we are His, and every gesture He makes towards us is intended to gain our response, so that He might conform us into His own likeness.

We have thus far argued that God seeks us through nature, intuition, reason, and our own self-consciousness, as well as through the Bible. Last time we pointed to the poets and philosophers as envoys of God to a pagan world, not only in pointing towards a Redeemer who was to come, but by teaching a morality that helped to attune Greek and Roman culture for God’s entrance into humanity through Christ. We affirmed that the philosophers have spoken for God, and that the scriptures themselves recognize this and draw upon them as witnesses of heaven. We are saying, as do the scriptures, that God has never left Himself without witness, and that His witnesses may well range from “the starry heavens above and the moral law within man,” to use Kant’s words, to a Greek poet and a Roman philosopher.

Now we speak more particularly of a single witness to the ancient world, Socrates of Athens, who was born about 470 B.C. and died as a martyr in 399 B.C. It is our conviction that God was in Socrates preparing the Greek mind for the coming of His Christ. At a time when the Greeks were steeped in superstition and ignorance and engulfed in idolatry and moral decadence, it was Socrates, who called himself “the gadfly of God,” that so aroused the Athenians to think critically about themselves that Greek culture turned in a new direction, a direction that was to meet Paul halfway when he came to Athens to witness for the Christ.

To appreciate Socrates as an envoy of God one must realize the darkness that engulfed Athens in those times. There was no knowledge of God. Immorality was rampant, homosexuality being almost as common as marital sex. A bitter, cruel war raged on and on with

neighboring Sparta. The gods men worshipped were more immoral even than themselves, committing incest and rape as well as murder. And yet it was a period of great minds, for no less figures than Sophocles, Herodotus, and Pericles were contemporaries of Socrates. But these men believed in a reason void of God. The Jews had not yet been dispersed, so their moral and prophetic teachings were not yet known. The great prophets of Israel had done their work in faraway Palestine, but insofar as we know Socrates had no way of knowing about them.

Yet he was God's gadfly to Athens, and he believed he had a mission that was not essentially different to that of the prophets of Israel. He sealed that mission by choosing to die as a martyr, believing as he did that "God so directs us."

From an early age he displayed the kind of mind that is attracted to spiritual values. Even as a boy he listened to what he later called his "divine sign," an inner voice that warned him of impending dangers. His powers of concentration were remarkable, for he could get lost in thought for hours at a time, completely insensible to what was going on around him. Alcibiades, one of his students, tells how his master once stood from early morning on one day until sunrise of the next, absorbed in thought. It was also Alcibiades, a handsome youth admired by the men of his acquaintance, who tells how he once laid down with Socrates while he slept, offering himself sexually, only to learn that the master was more interested in ideas than sex, that kind of sex at least. It was Alcibiades that likened Socrates to a satyr, being as wise, crafty and mysterious as he was.

He was perhaps the first man in history to teach the immortality of the soul, a doctrine somewhat different from the scriptural view of the spirit of man, for Socrates believed that the soul is uncreated and eternal, which gives place for the idea of reincarnation. But he had this exalted view of man's nature at a time when the Greeks had only a sensual view of man. He urged the Athenians to nurture their souls as they did their bodies, and pointed them to spiritual values at a time when they were so crassly materialistic.

Like Jesus of Nazareth who was to follow him, he spoke the language of love, a love that begins with the beauties of this world and then soars on to the beauties of mind and spirit in worlds beyond. He was also like Jesus in that he left no writings behind, but moved about as a freelance teacher with a band of disciples, using the simplest of language to convey profound truths. He was also like the Christ in that he gave his life for what he believed to be right, being innocent of the charges made against him.

He was proud of being an Athenian, but he believed that loyalty to one's country implied a critical attitude towards its ideals and institutions. He was intent upon improving the culture that he loved, not in merely preserving the status quo, and he applied his free and inquiring mind to this task. Since he was teaching fresh concepts, the youth of the city was attracted to him; and since he questioned the religious practices of his neighbors, many became skeptical of the old ways of thinking. Thus he was charged with corrupting

the youth and with teaching atheism, and was hauled into court where he was found guilty and sentenced to die.

Socrates' crime was in being different. He wanted to know about man and the universe, and he was not content with the easy answers that had so long been given to serious questions. He believed it to be his task to re-complexify the oversimplifications. He wanted to know about goodness, reality, justice, and the essence of human existence. So he asked a lot of questions of those who were supposed to know, but found them more ignorant than himself, for they presumed to know when he knew he did not know. He humbly conceded "I know nothing." And for such reasons the oracle at Delphi, the official seer, proclaimed Socrates the wisest man in Athens.

His mission was to call people to repentance, to cause them to examine their lives, nurture their souls, and cultivate the higher values. "The unexamined life is not worth living," he insisted, and he would use innuendo and irony to get his point across. He feigned to be ignorant of grave issues in order to draw those who presumed to know into conversation. To a young man who had the audacity to sue his own father in court on the charge of impiety, Socrates said: "Anyone who would sue his own father for such a charge surely knows what it is, and I have always wanted to know. So, please, teach me about piety." After such encounters, with Socrates always asking searching questions and never being satisfied with the superficial answers, such ones would usually turn away with a deflated ego or frankly admit that they did not know what they were talking about, or both.

Socrates was convinced that he was called of God to convince his fellow citizens of their ignorance, and he spoke of one God, while those around him paid homage to all sorts of gods. Believing as he did that God has placed universal truths deep within man's moral consciousness, he explored the mind in search of ideas, using the technique of question and answer. And so he gave to the world what is known as "dialectic" or "the Socratic method," which assumes that truth will emerge from the morass of error and superstition in the crucible of competing ideas, somewhat like churning produces butter.

When Socrates heard that the oracle has pronounced him to be the wisest of men, he accepted it as the voice of God. And so he asked, "What can God mean by this saying?" His conclusion, after interviewing all those who presumed to be wise, was that only God is really wise and that human wisdom is of little value. So what God really means, Socrates observed, was that only he is wise who realizes that he knows nothing at all.

And so he says: "I still go about testing and examining every man whom I think wise, whether he be a citizen or a stranger, as God has commanded me; and whenever I find that he is not wise, I point Out to him on the part of God that he is not wise."

Like an Amos or a Jeremiah he would say: "I am in very great poverty by reason of my service to God." This was so because he dared to tell a culture that was proud of its wisdom that "I believe that only God is really wise."

His friends could have arranged his escape from prison and from death, but he refused this by explaining: “It would be very strange conduct on my part if I were to desert my post now from fear of death or of any other thing, when God has commanded me, as I am persuaded that he has done, to spend my life in searching for wisdom, and in examining myself and others.”

Socrates urged the Athenians to give more care to the soul and less to making money and reputation. When this call to repentance threatened his safety, he said: “Athenians, I hold you in the highest regard and love; but I will obey God rather than you: and as long as I have breath and strength I will not cease from philosophy, and from exhorting you, and declaring the truth to everyone of you whom I meet …”

When he spoke of “the truth” he had reference to man’s dependence upon God. The Greeks had assumed themselves adequate without God. Socrates believed that if he did not warn them of their misdirected lives no one else would. “I think that I am the gadfly that God has sent to the city to attack it,” and since Athens would not likely find anyone else to do such a thankless task, he urged them not to sin against God by executing him. He went on to prophesy that if they did destroy him Athens would be overtaken by tragedy. Even up to the hour of his death the old philosopher, now 70, believed that “the sign of God” was directing his life.

Few in the pagan world before Christ could have talked as Socrates did in the hour of death. To those who condemned him he said: “Now the time has come and we must go hence. I to die and you to live. Whether life or death is better is known to God, and to God only.” And when he was asked about how he wanted to be buried he gave an answer that is far more Christian than pagan.

“Bury me as you please,” he answered, “only you must catch me first.” He explained that he was not his body, that his body might be buried, but not Socrates himself. “I shall not remain with you after I have drunk the poison, but shall go away to the happiness of the blest.” And so he urged his disciples to watch their language since wrong ideas can do evil to their soul, and to make it clear that it is Socrates’ *body* they are burying rather than Socrates himself. As for his body, they could bury it as they pleased.

And so Socrates died, talking about the immortality of the soul to the very last.

The old gadfly showed more faith in death than many of us Christians, and certainly a more responsible attitude toward the destiny of both body and soul. And his subtle humor was present even in death—telling his disciples that they would have to catch him first if they wanted to bury him, indicating that the soul would quickly make its flight.

As much as we admire one who can die as nobly as did Socrates, it is going too far, as do some humanists, to say that Socrates’ death was more exemplary than the Christ’s. He died more like a man, they say, while Jesus weakened under the ordeal. Socrates could pass jokes, bathe and dress himself for burial, and even console the executioner who

brought him the poison to drink. But Jesus prayed that the cup might be taken away, and he suffered agony in the garden as he awaited his executioners. Who died the better way?, the humanists ask, looking as they do to Socrates as a father of humanism.

As I point out to my students at the university, there is no comparison between the experiences of the two men, and the humanists' effort to make a comparison only reveals that they understand neither the death of Socrates nor of Jesus. Socrates was an old man who had lived a fruitful life with a minimum of frustration. He had fulfilled his God-given mission, so death lay before him as his next great experience, one that would take him to the presence of God. Jesus, on the other hand, had taken upon Himself the sins of all mankind, and His ordeal was in bearing God's judgment against sin, not in the experience of death itself. And there is, to be sure, a vast difference in drinking poison in the presence of your friends and being crucified by the Romans in the presence of your enemies.

We have a better perspective of Socrates when we see him as a tutor unto Christ, preparing the Greek mind for the implantation of the gospel. He made them conscious of the soul and the need for spiritual values. He taught them how to die without fear. He spoke of God and immortality, laying the groundwork for the idea of revelation: *that God is both real and one who reveals himself to man.* He taught them the meaning of a prophetic mission, that he himself was called of God to bring them to repentance. He placed faith alongside reason. He was not merely a gadfly (a term the Athenians themselves used of Socrates), for there were always troublemakers around, but he was God's gadfly. Once he did his work, it was easier and more consistent for Paul to do his. God's gadfly was an envoy for God's apostle.

How are we to account for a Socrates in the ancient world, centuries before Christ, isolated from Judaism, and having never seen a Bible? Yet he comes up talking about man's Soul, urging his fellows to reform, and preaching about the one God of heaven, and even laying down his life confident of immortality. And all this in a pagan world that worshipped the impossible gods of Homer, and that still had its idols centuries later when Paul walked through its streets.

Our conclusion is that God made Socrates a hound of heaven, pursuing the Greek mind in an effort to capture it for God and to prepare it for the gospel of Christ. God used Socrates to keep Greek thought from going so far astray that it could not be an instrument of heaven for the promulgation of the gospel. Socrates is one reason why it was possible for the gospel to be preached and written in the Greek language.

So the mind of God touched Socrates just as it has touched others in the divine quest. God inspired him for his work, enabling him to do for coming generations what God's plan called for. Socrates came to know God through the longing of his own soul, through reason and intuition, through nature, and perhaps even through some of the literature of his time, lost to us.

If ever you visit the ruins of ancient Athens and see the remnants of the glory that was Greece, you will no doubt think of the apostle Paul standing on Mar's Hill. But think also of old Socrates, five centuries earlier, walking those same streets and telling the Athenians, "I must obey God rather than you," and dying for that faith.

The Hound of Heaven has long been in pursuit of man.—*the Editor*

⁂ ⁂ ⁂

CHURCH OF CHRIST ROAD MARKERS

By T. F. McNABB

The other day I was looking through my new copy of the latest Gospel Advocate catalog. I turned to the front inside page and saw an attractive advertisement which arrested my attention. In fact, I had to blink my eyes twice to make sure I was reading correctly; for there, in prominent letters, was an advertisement for "Church of Christ Road Markers."

The reason I was momentarily startled was that I remembered reading sermons and articles in various unofficial Church of Christ publications that one should never use the phrase "Church of Christ" as an adjective. In fact, several times I had been corrected when casually referring to something about a "Church of Christ preacher", "a Church of Christ orphanage", "a Church of Christ college", or a "Church of Christ Lectureship." I was informed there were no such things and that this was the language of Ashdod!

And now here "Church of Christ" was being used as an adjective, on prominent display, coming from a leading seat of non-instrumental orthodoxy!

Now I find nothing essentially wrong in a church supply house, such as the Gospel Advocate company, selling "Church of Christ Road Markers," or "Church of Christ" outdoor bulletin boards and signs. In fact, for those who wish to denominate themselves as such, I think it is economically feasible to have a standardized "Church of Christ" sign, which can be purchased at a centralized supplier.

The advertising goes on to state that "all [the signs] have 'Church of Christ' lettered in black in upper panel," with a "black directional panel below which may be lettered locally."

Now that sounds like a good idea—to have space for lettering the sign locally, for additional clarification.

One problem, however, is that "Church of Christ" is quite an ambiguous phrase, and without some clarification, there might be some confusion to those reading the directions.

I notice in reading church signs here and there over the country that many churches of different denominations are careful to properly denominate themselves, whereby visitors do not get confused as to what kind of church they might be attending.

For example, sometimes in the North, one sees a sign reading, ". . . . . Baptist Church (Southern Baptist Convention)" ; or, further down the street might be another church with a sign that reads, ". . . . . .. Baptist Church (Non-Convention)." In one town I noticed one sign reading "Church of God—Headquarters, Anderson, Indiana," while a few blocks across town was another sign reading, "Church of God—Headquarters, Cleveland, Tennessee." These simple suffix explanations can mean a lot to members of these respective groups who want to be sure they have found the right church.

In some places nowadays the various Churches of Christ are making sure the public understands their differences, too, and that visitors to the city find the right kind of Church of Christ. For example, I have a Saturday church advertising page from a large city newspaper, and notice four or five different kinds of "Church of Christ."

Twelve churches are listed in a block under "Churches of Christ," with explanatory notes identifying them as premillennial; fourteen churches are listed in another "Churches of Christ" block identifying them as anti-premillennial, "a-mills" I suppose you could call them. Then a single church has a block all its own associating itself as a sponsor of the Herald of Truth Television program. I suppose this would be an institutional, pro-cooperative-efforts Church of Christ. Another group is blocked out as "Churches of Christ (Christian Church) ," which leads one to believe they would be instrumental music churches.

If churches can be segregated in the newspaper, identifying themselves as to the party with which they belong, then it would seem a good idea to add sufficient remarks on a "Church of Christ Road Marker" sign or outdoor bulletin board sign to identify the party or theological school of thought to which it has allegiance.

A few years ago some old-line Congregational Church groups amalgamated and named their new organization the "United Church of Christ." They now use that title locally. Surely no non-instrumental Church of Christ would want to be confused with that! A sign reading "Church of Christ—Not United," might solve the problem. Some denominational neighbors, who had heard of some of the internal dissensions in the local Church of Christ, might feel the title quite fitting!

Then, too, in recent months some Churches of Christ have been disturbed by some few members who claim to have reached a closer relationship with the Holy Spirit than that ordinarily sanctioned by Church of Christ doctrines. Some even claim to have spoken in tongues! Now while this was controversial in the early church days of Paul, one should not be surprised that it would be controversial today, also. Paul dealt with the problem with charity and gave instruction concerning the regulation of the gift in the church, but

nowhere do we read where he recommended those professing spiritual gifts be disfellowshipped from the communion of saints. One could hardly imagine Paul writing an excommunication bull on members who professed a deeper relationship in the Holy Spirit and who had given testimony of their experience. Neither could one imagine him sending this bull to the weekly *Solid Rock* periodical (assuming there was such a publication) as a notice to "the brotherhood."

Some local churches, ministers and Church of Christ leaders want no part with such a Holy Spirit move. In order to serve notice to the public, perhaps they could letter their sign locally, adding an explanatory suffix. The sign would read "Church of Christ—No Tongues." Passerbys might wonder how the members communicated with one another, but, nevertheless, this would be a notice to everyone of this church's stand on this controversial issue.

There are other instances one could name, whereby proper identification could be locally lettered. We heard of one Restoration group that decided that since they spoke where the Bible spoke, they would abide by Paul's admonition and "greet the brethren with a holy kiss." Another local church ostracized this "heretical" church from fellowship. They would not be identified with this group! The church issuing the disfellowship notice might label their sign, "Church of Christ—No Holy Kissing." Some young couples and other romantic prospects might shun the church with such a sign, but the sign would let the world know where they stood on this issue.

We heard about another Church of Christ group who decided they would abide by the Lord's admonition and wash one another's feet. Some other churches took offense at this. To let the public know where they stand, they might label their sign, "Church of Christ—No Feet Washing." The public might raise their eyebrows as to the health and sanitation status of the members, but the suffix would identify the church as to what it was not.

There are a lot of other labels we could think of that could be placed on the black panel below the standardized "Church of Christ" lettering, such as, "Gospel Advocate", "Gospel Guardian", "Firm Foundation", "Anti-cooperation", "Anti-Orphan's home church supporters", "One-cuppers", "No Handle Cuppers", "Pro-christian Colleges", "Fermented Grape Juicers", "Plain Grape Juicers", etc., to name only a few.

One wonders what the early church and saints did without such modern signs (these are advertised as "now reflectorized"), especially when many of the Christians had to meet secretly. Any kind of sign might have been to their disadvantage in inviting persecution and bringing an abrupt halt to their worship. But somehow they did grow and increase; the word was spread abroad, and many were added to the church daily. And that with no "Church of Christ Road Marker" signs, nor any other kind of denominational signs.

"Church of Christ Road Markers," and standardized "Church of Christ" signs seem but another mark of a religious group maturing as a denomination. As someone remarked, when motoring along the road, and reading one of these signs: "There's a Church of Christ sign. Is it pointing to a Church of Christ Church, where a Church of Christ minister preaches a Church of Christ sermon to the Church of Christ folks?" It could be!—*T. F. McNabb is an army chaplain stationed at Fort Dix, N. J.*

⁂ ⁂ ⁂

God and Culture . . .

CHURCH MUSIC AND THE CULTURAL EXPLOSION

By Jackson Hill

The United States is currently experiencing a great cultural explosion. In the last several years a vast awakening of interest in history, literature, art, the drama, and music, has resulted in changing the artistic tastes of a large segment of our nation. For example, today nearly twice as many Americans are attending concerts as are going to baseball games, a fact which is evidenced by the existence of over 1,200 symphony orchestras in the United States. It seems clear that the cultural explosion is a product of the liberal arts education and the increasingly greater number of young people going to college every year.

Although this cultural awakening is encouraging art and fostering artistic creation to a degree never before seen in this country, it poses several difficult problems for the church and the current status of church music. Many people are thinking more seriously about the music they sing, and many congregations are being held back in their musical growth by song leaders who are less perceptive than those being led.

It may be significant, too, that practically every religious group in the United States has recently revised the body of its music. The Churches of Christ have not. In the 19th century the Restoration church borrowed its music from the groups from which its members came. Most of the music used in Restoration services was composed by Americans to suit the American situation. These were primarily the rousing folk-like songs of the Baptists and frontier Methodists. Few of the noble hymns of the Scotts' Psalter survived the days of Alexander Campbell, for most of the Restoration flock came from less "dignified" frontier groups. It is rather the "gospel songs" that today make up the bulk of the music in the Churches of Christ.

In addition, today there is a growing feeling that the eleven o'clock service of the church should be devoted more to worship than to evangelism and that the gospel songs are not particularly worshipful in character. It has been suggested that these songs have more meaning when sung at gospel meetings or prayer meetings than at services of worship.

We may observe, too the increase in the number of college students turning from non-liturgic bodies such as the Baptist and Methodist groups to participate in the more solemn and stately services of the Episcopal church, whose liturgy is enriched by a tradition of over 350 years of Anglican chant and anthem.

Likewise, we may have difficulty in attracting arts-centered members of the current rising generation to certain of our own services. For it is often the case that the person who is even an occasional concert-goer and who listens to Bach, Mozart, and Beethoven at home, will probably not be satisfied with singing "There Shall Be showers of Blessing" and "Pow'r in the Blood" in worship. His liberal arts education has provided him with certain standards of music and poetry, and unless these are met to some extent in the song service, he cannot derive from worship a full measure of spiritual edification and uplifting.

The problems posed by trying to improve the state of our music and out attitude toward sacred song may be approached, if not solved, by our becoming aware of the two traditions which make up the greater body of sacred music. The first of these is that frontier tradition which accounts for the "gospel songs" which we sing. The second is that continuous thread of sacred music which springs from the ancient synagogue and passes through the Middle Ages into and beyond the great era of Palestrina and J. S. Bach. It is this tradition of which we are least informed.

Despite the fact that the scriptures do not provide much information as to the nature of music in the early church, other ancient writings, musicological scholarship, and archaeology have provided answers to many questions. We know, for instance, that the bulk of the music employed by the early church was adopted from the liturgy of the synagogue. In fact, the first half of a *Syriac* communion service, as documented in the 2nd century, is nearly identical to the contemporary Jewish synagogue services. Without doubt, the Psalms played the most important role in the music of the early church. These psalms were most often performed responsorially, that is, with each line being divided between leader and congregation. We know that the hymns were originally poems of praise, although no Christian hymns survive from the very earliest period. The "spiritual songs" were the canticles adopted from Jewish liturgy, with scriptural (or Apocryphal) texts, such as the canticles of Daniel (Dan 3), Isaiah (Is 12), Tobit (Tobit 19), Judith (Judith 16), Moses (Deut 32), and so forth. These "spiritual songs" should by no means be equated with the "gospel song" of the American frontier. In terms of purely musical style, the

"gospel songs" would probably relate more closely to the music used in the worship of Dionysus.

As Christianity spread, its chant was colored by the traditions of the peoples which it encountered. Greek elements, as well as Egyptian, Syrian, and many others, crept into the music in various locations and made for varying musical styles and practices. The tradition of Christian chant, adopted initially from the Jewish synagogue, can be readily traced through the Middle Ages within the enormous body of Gregorian chant. Many of these Gregorian tunes date far back into the Jewish tradition (for example, the basic melody of "When I Survey the Wond'rous Cross").

After a long period of increasing musical complexity during the late Middle Ages and the Renaissance, the European reformers attempted to bring music back to the congregation through the Psalters—collections of metrical settings of the Psalms with simple tunes which all could sing. Most denominations make considerable use of this great wealth of song; at most, only three or four of these songs survive in Church of Christ hymnals. Out of the tradition of the Psalter came the Lutheran chorale, the Presbyterian psalm tune, and the modern European hymn.

The native hymns sung in America, west of the Appalachians and in the South, were stylistically derived from folk culture—a culture which little differentiated musically between song and dance. For the first time since the late Middle Ages, hymns appeared in bouncing 6/8 and 12/8 dance rhythms, the meters traditionally associated with the "jig."

With the eventual passing of the frontier tradition, most American denominations have returned to the more noble stately hymns of the European tradition. Yet we, along with a few other (mainly Southern) groups have continued to make the "gospel hymn" the mainstay of our musical diet.

In order to reach people who have not been reared on "Bringing In the Sheaves" (and there are many!), and in order to add greater meaning to our worship, we should make greater use of our more noble and worshipful hymns, such as those which one of our standard hymnals denotes as its "Part II: The Hymns." It is time, especially in our urban areas, for us to realize in our worship the passing of a frontier tradition, in favor of taking advantage of the best hymns at our disposal, and thereby being more in tune with contemporary attitudes and higher standards of literature, art, and music, not to mention the added reward of giving of our best to the Lord.

The tendency toward making greater use of the stately hymns has already become quite pronounced in many localities. Here, the standard "invitation" songs, at least at the 11:00 hour, are being replaced by songs which serve not only as invitations but also as hymns of rededication and devotion, such as "O Master, Let Me Walk With Thee", "Take My Life and Let It Be" (Mozart's), and "Thou Art the Way."

It is not to say that there is no place for “Are You Washed in the Blood of the Lamb”, or “Showers of Blessing”, or “Standing on the Promises”, for there most assuredly is; it is rather to say that there is a greater place for “Crown Him with Many Crowns”, “O God, Our Help in Ages Past” (St. Anne), and the response, “Glory Be to the Father”, in our worship.

———————

—Jackson Hill is an Instructor of Music at Duke University, Durham, N. C.

⁂ ⁂ ⁂

OFFICE NOTES

We hope soon to issue our bound volume of *Restoration Review* for 1967, under the title “Things That Matter Most.” It will have its own introduction, table of contents, and colorful dust jacket—all to match the 1966 volume, “Resources of Power.” You may order these at 3.00 each.

We have said little in recent months about two monographs that should be of interest to our readers. One is *Alexander Campbell: the Man and His Mission,* written by Leroy Garrett and Louis Cochran; the Other is *Alexander Campbell and Thomas Jefferson, a Comparative Study of Two old Virginians*, by Leroy Garrett. A lot of work and research went into these little volumes and we think you’ll appreciate the effort. There are now only a few hundred left, and we’ll sell those at the rate of both for 1.00.

All last year we ran a review of *Voices of Concern.* Even though we might have gone longer we decided to limit it to ten installments. It so happened, however, that one essay in the book, written by Prof. Norman Parks of Middle Tennessee State University, was widely acclaimed the most significant, or certainly one of the most significant, of them all, and yet it was not reviewed. We urged the reviewer, Prof. Bales of Harding College, to be sure to include the Parks piece, which he was not able to do until the year had run out. We now have at hand Prof. Bales’ review and Prof. Parks’ response. So we plan in the next issue to run this exchange. It is not too late to get your copy of *Voices of Concern: Critical Studies in Church of Christism* at only 3.00 by writing to our office.

The American Far Right is a study of Billy James Hargis and his Christian Crusade. It gives insight into an important facet of religious and political thought in the U. S. A. One of our Church of Christ colleges gets mentioned. 4.50.

Why Christians Crack Up!, written by a psychiatrist who is a devoted Christian, is a book that tells about emotional disturbances, their roots and remedies. He talks about whether emotional illness is inherited, causes of immaturity, and rules for good mental health, and much more—all from the perspective of the Christian. This book is well worth both your money and time. We highly recommend it. Preachers will find in it a wealth of information for counseling and teaching. 3.95 in hardcover.

For only 2.00 we can send you a copy of *Walter Scott Speaks,* an important addition to your Restoration library.

⁂ ⁂ ⁂

RESTORATION REVIEW is published monthly (except July and August) at 1201 Windsor Dr., Denton, Texas. Leroy Garrett, Editor. Second class permit at Denton, Texas. Subscription rate is $1.00 per annum; 50 cents in clubs of 6 or more.

Address all mail to: 1201 Windsor Drive, Denton, Texas 76201.*